

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were submitted for examination December 18, 2001. In an Office Action dated February 19, 2002, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Klein, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stone, under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Wang, under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Dai, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Parkinson and under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cobb. Claims 2-3 and 7 have been canceled by applicants and new claims 23-28 have been added. No new matter has been introduced in this amendment. Claims 1, 4-6 and 8-28 are now pending.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-22 – Anticipated by Klein

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 as being anticipated by Klein. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Klein does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention as amended.

At a minimum, Klein does not teach or suggest applicants claim 1 limitations of “dividing the site into at least two areas of coverage including a first coverage area and a second coverage area, determining if the first coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time and determining if the second coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time.” As Klein does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 11, 13 and 18 contain similar language and for similar reasons their rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 4-6, 8-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-22 depend from allowable claims and are thus also allowable. Claims 2-3 and 7 have been canceled by applicants.

New claim 23 contains the limitations of “dividing the specified period of time into at least two periods of time including a first period of time and a second period of time, determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the first period in time and determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the second period in

time.” At a minimum Klein does not teach or suggest these claim limitations, and thus claim 23 is allowable. Claims 27 and 28 contain similar language and for similar reasons are allowable. Claims 24-26 depend from an allowable claim and thus are also allowable.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-22 – Anticipated by Stone

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 as being anticipated by Stone. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Stone does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention as amended.

At a minimum, Stone does not teach or suggest applicants claim 1 limitations of “dividing the site into at least two areas of coverage including a first coverage area and a second coverage area, determining if the first coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time and determining if the second coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time.” As Stone does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 11, 13 and 18 contain similar language and for similar reasons their rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 4-6, 8-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-22 depend from allowable claims and are thus also allowable. Claims 2-3 and 7 have been canceled by applicants.

New claim 23 contains the limitations of “dividing the specified period of time into at least two periods of time including a first period of time and a second period of time, determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the first period in time and determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the second period in time.” At a minimum Stone does not teach or suggest these claim limitations, and thus claim 23 is allowable. Claims 27 and 28 contain similar language and for similar reasons are allowable. Claims 24-26 depend from an allowable claim and thus are also allowable.

35 U.S.C. §102(a) Rejection of Claims 1-22 – Anticipated by Wang

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 as being anticipated by Wang. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Wang does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention as amended.

At a minimum, Wang does not teach or suggest applicants claim 1 limitations of “dividing the site into at least two areas of coverage including a first coverage area and a second coverage area, determining if the first coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time and determining if the second coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time.” As Wang does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 11, 13 and 18 contain similar language and for similar reasons their rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 4-6, 8-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-22 depend from allowable claims and are thus also allowable. Claims 2-3 and 7 have been canceled by applicants.

New claim 23 contains the limitations of “dividing the specified period of time into at least two periods of time including a first period of time and a second period of time, determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the first period in time and determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the second period in time.” At a minimum Wang does not teach or suggest these claim limitations, and thus claim 23 is allowable. Claims 27 and 28 contain similar language and for similar reasons are allowable. Claims 24-26 depend from an allowable claim and thus are also allowable.

35 U.S.C. §102(a) Rejection of Claims 1-22 – Anticipated by Dai

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 as being anticipated by Dai. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Dai does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention as amended.

At a minimum, Dai does not teach or suggest applicants claim 1 limitations of “dividing the site into at least two areas of coverage including a first coverage area and a

second coverage area, determining if the first coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time and determining if the second coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time.” As Dai does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 13 and 18 contain similar language and for similar reasons their rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 4-6, 8-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-22 depend from allowable claims and are thus also allowable. Claims 2-3 and 7 have been canceled by applicants.

New claim 23 contains the limitations of “dividing the specified period of time into at least two periods of time including a first period of time and a second period of time, determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the first period in time and determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the second period in time.” At a minimum Dai does not teach or suggest these claim limitations, and thus claim 23 is allowable. Claims 27 and 28 contain similar language and for similar reasons are allowable. Claims 24-26 depend from an allowable claim and thus are also allowable.

#### 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-22 – Anticipated by Parkinson

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 as being anticipated by Parkinson. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Parkinson does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention as amended.

At a minimum, Parkinson does not teach or suggest applicants claim 1 limitations of “dividing the site into at least two areas of coverage including a first coverage area and a second coverage area, determining if the first coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time and determining if the second coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time.” As Parkinson does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 11, 13 and 18 contain similar language and for similar reasons their rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 4-6, 8-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-22 depend from allowable claims and are thus also allowable. Claims 2-3 and 7 have been canceled by applicants.

New claim 23 contains the limitations of “dividing the specified period of time into at least two periods of time including a first period of time and a second period of time, determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the first period in time and determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the second period in time.” At a minimum Parkinson does not teach or suggest these claim limitations, and thus claim 23 is allowable. Claims 27 and 28 contain similar language and for similar reasons are allowable. Claims 24-26 depend from an allowable claim and thus are also allowable.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-22 – Anticipated by Cobb

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 as being anticipated by Cobb. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Cobb does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention as amended.


At a minimum, Cobb does not teach or suggest applicants claim 1 limitations of “dividing the site into at least two areas of coverage including a first coverage area and a second coverage area, determining if the first coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time and determining if the second coverage area is covered by at least one GPS satellite at the specified point in time.” As Cobb does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 11, 13 and 18 contain similar language and for similar reasons their rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 4-6, 8-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-22 depend from allowable claims and are thus also allowable. Claims 2-3 and 7 have been canceled by applicants.

New claim 23 contains the limitations of “dividing the specified period of time into at least two periods of time including a first period of time and a second period of time, determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the first period in time and determining if the site is covered by at least one GPS satellite during the second period in time.” At a minimum Cobb does not teach or suggest these claim limitations, and thus claim 23 is allowable. Claims 27 and 28 contain similar language and for similar reasons are allowable. Claims 24-26 depend from an allowable claim and thus are also allowable.

Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is in condition for allowance and action towards a notice of allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robin S. Fahlberg", written over a horizontal line.

Robin S. Fahlberg  
Registration No. 50,323  
Caterpillar Inc.

Telephone: (309) 675-5682

Facsimile: (309) 675-1236